BBC Panorama 3/6/75
Jesse Curry

Int Are you suggesting there is still an attempt by the um CBI, the FBI and the CIA to thwart the authorities in trying to find out what actually happened.

It is difficult to say from which source that these attempts to thwart arise, there is no doubt in my mind that the agencies of Government were ~~it~~ not limited to that, it's broader than them, I do not want an investigation to proceed not necessarily because they are involved in some way with the assassination or but it was certainly suggested to me that there were involvement by people a agencies of govt. prior and after the assassination in a manner that if it surfaced would perhaps show some dereliction of responsibility, some conduct that perhaps might be hard to explain For example why was it that the, an alleged conversation that Oswald had in Mexico City which was on a tape, never surfaced, th the tape was destroyed that it lately appeared that that tape was not destroyed until after the assassination of President Kennedy er those are areas that are very delicate and it doesn't mean an involvement in the assassination, it may, it may not, but it certainly suggests that something might surface that might be embarrassing and for these reasons, and no other, there were attempts to thwart the investigation.

Int I wonder if we could perhaps talk about the episode of when Oswal pooportedly went to Mexico, can you tell me what you found out happened.

Well I think we have to understand its significance first er there is some indication that rather than being in Mexico City at a certain time Oswald may have been in Dallas and talking then about the assassination of President Kennedy and also some indication that perhaps he was in the company of a certain CIA agent. That is disputed on the basis that Oswald could not have been there and he must have been in Mexico City and part of the claim that he must have been in Mexico City is based upon the fact that he allegedly had gone into the Cuban Embassy and had called er the Russian Embassy and there was a wire tap which picked Oswald up in that phone conversation and that became part of the proof, showingOswald could not have been in Dallas and therefore was in Mexico City... However the photographs allegedly of Oswald going into the Cuban Embassy as we all know in fact were not photographs of Oswald. Secondly it turns out that those photographs, even if they were of the wrong person you would expect they would be of a person entering the Cuban Embassy but it turns out they are photographs of someone entering the Russian Embassy and the question raised how could they so mix up even what building we're talking about. In addition when we enquire where were the photographs you took of people who entered the Cuban Embassy on the day in question, we a told that the cameras did not work that day and we then wanna start talking. I want to talk to the camera people, I wanna find out is that true and that's where we got stopped. In addition, h

...

Ibt How did you get stopped.

I never got that far, all hell broke lose and the er issues got diverted, we had to defend ourselves in terms of attacks by the congress and the press to continue the investigation but in addition for example where was the tape conversation itself, tape was destroyed, the CIA said that they had re-used that tape prior to the assassination of president Kennedy yet the FBI has a document stating that some of their agents listened to the tape after the assassination of President Kennedy and the voice on that was not Oswalds, in addition the CIA presented a transcript of that conversation, we had interviewed the typist who typed it up who said that the transcript presented was not in fact/was typed up by whoever it was who spoke on that conversation. These are areas that I wanted to get into and at the time I did and started to make it clear that I was gonna demand the appearances of witnesses, I was gonna get their documents, that's when the attacks really reached a crescendo in the Congress and whatever er was left was spent really defending ourselves add just trying to just get the investigation to continue.

/what

Int What did you see as the cause, the motive of those attacks.

Well I think that er for some reason, and I am not a subscribe to a gigantic conspiracy, you know I was struck when Theo Sanderson withdrew from the nomination that he had been offered the handle CIA Director and he said, and I'm paraphrasing here, that a lot of dirty streams combined to pollute the river, I put in the word dirty, he just said a lot of streams combined but I think that's what happened here in Washington, that there are people who do not want the investigation, there are branches of the media that do not want a thorough investigation, there are members of governmental agencies that do not want an investigation and it's a combined effect of each of these each having their own motives that was able to come together and as far as I'm concerned effectively kill the investigation and letters going on, censors (?) just going through the forum and the motion of the appearance of an investigation.

Int I wonder if we could talk about when er Oswald proportedly went to Russia, what did you feel about the evidence that there was about Oswald's Russian visit.

and the autopsy evidence, have not been released by the Government; why do you think they have been retained?

an: I - I don't know, I can't - I can't figure out why they want to keep this part of it so secret, unless there's something in there that would ruin their theory, or would make them seem to have jumped to conclusions on their report.

it: What do you think, and again I quote your own book, of the fact that certain portions of that autopsy evidence were destroyed?

an: Well I think that's just like some other things that were destroyed, like the note at the F.B.I. I don't know what reasons it was destroyed for, but you can only say that if evidence - if evidence is destroyed, somebody, or someone in high authority, does not want that evidence revealed.

3/1

nt: Why do you think, and again I quote your own book, that certain portions of the autopsy evidence were destroyed?

an: I don't have the least idea as to why they were destroyed, you can only come to the conclusion, if evidence is destroyed someone doesn't want it to be revealed. Now why they would not want it revealed, that's something that I can't answer, but certainly all evidence, in any case, should be preserved, it shouldn't be destroyed.

nt: You have referred to the Warren Commission yielding to political pressure, and never examining the autopsy

Well I didn't go into the detail there but his trip to Russia raised a number of questions that we wanted to get into, for example when any American went to Russia and renounced his American citizenship and subsequently changed his mind and wanted to come back to this country, upon returning to this country there was a thorough de-briefing by the CIA, but with one exception as far as we could ascertain, Oswald, and that raised a lot of questions. Why the exception, why was he not debriefed by the CIA.

Shot 265/1

In addition, when an American marries a Russian woman and attempts to get her back into this country there was normally a great deal of difficulty in getting the Russian wife back into the United States. From the examination that we went into, no on has been able to immediately come back to this country and bring his Russian wife with him, with one exception, and that was Oswald and his wife Maria. These start to raise a lot of questions and we wanted to go into, not just the fact that it occurred er ? records about that, but we wanted to find out who were the people responsible for the decision making and who was it that perhaps spoke to the people involved in the decision making and trace that back.

Int

Going back to Mexico City for a second, what was your feeling because of the various anamolies about the way the CIA behaved what was, what conclusion were you beginning to draw from that.

I I certainly came to the conclusion that there was some activi by the CIA with Oswald er prior to the assassination of Preside Kennedy that in no way is tobe interpreted as meaning that they were with Oswald in assassinating President Kennedy but that they had had some contacts whether they were using him as a source of information in Russia, whether or/they were utilising his name for some purposes I don't know, I never got that far along the road but it was more than merely the fact the CIA and an Oswald and never did the two meet.

/not

Int

The CIA agent ? said that he was asked by the CIA to help fabricate evidence about Oswald having been seen in Mexico City do you find that plausible.

photographs, what sort of political pressure do you imagine?

lan: I can't say for sure, but it must have been, you know, people in high - responsible areas of the Government; I'm just quoting now - I'm not quoting, I mean I'm just speculating, it could have been, you know, the - the Department of State, or it could have been somebody in the Presidential aide, some of those people, but as you have - as you have seen, from the Watergate incidents, that there were a lot of pressure put on people in that case, about certain things; now I can see how maybe those same people, or people that held their positions at the time, would be trying to suppress certain evidence.

Int: What sort of people, what sort of pressure was brought to bear on you at this end, in Dallas?

lan: Well, the pressure that I received here was mostly to get all the evidence that we had and send it to Washington, and that was coming - I'm sure that came from Hoover, where it was coming from. He felt like, I'm sure, that if he could get all that evidence in the laboratory up in Washington, then he could see what he wanted to do with it. Had it been left in Dallas, and - there would have been no cover-up of any kind of the evidence, whatever might have been ~~xxxxx~~ revealed in that evidence would have been made public. And I think that's the way it should have been. The President's dead, the event has occurred, you're doing everything you can to clear it up, and I couldn't - I couldn't see why someone would be so

secretive about some of the activities of the other agencies involved. As you know, the F.B.I. were adamant in their denial of any - any knowledge of Oswald, and the C.I.A. - they never contacted me to this day, that I know of, if they did they did it under a subterfuge of something else, because I was never talked to by a C.I.A. agent.

nt: Well let's talk about the F.B.I. for the moment; the F.B.I. recently admitted that a note was delivered to their office here, by Lee Harvey Oswald, just before the assassination, and that that vital evidence was destroyed, on orders from Washington, and that it was actually thrown down the toilet. What's your reaction to that?

an: I think that it was a stupid thing to do, I think that any good investigator would want all of the evidence, and he would do everything he could to preserve the evidence, so the idea that this - this, I know, must have been a part of the - the cover-up the F.B.I. was making, saying that they didn't know anything about Oswald. If this letter had been made public, why that would have blown their statement altogether.

nt: You believe that they did know about Oswald.

an: I know that they knew about him.

nt: What did they know about him, do you think?

an: Well they knew where he was living, Adrian Hosti(?) had attempted to contact him 2 or 3 times, and did contact his wife 2 or 3 times, so there's no doubt but what they knew he was here. And there's no doubt but what they